

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

|   | APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|---|--|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| _ | 09/887,066   | 06/25/2001      | Duriez Gilbert       | 612.40180X00            | 1768             |  |
|   | 20457 7  | 7590 08/29/2002 |                      |                         |                  |  |
|   | ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS<br>SUITE 1800<br>1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET |                 |                      | EXAMI                   | EXAMINER         |  |
|   |  |                 |                      | SIEFKE, SAMUEL P        |                  |  |
|   | ARLINGTON, VA 22209  |                 |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| • |  |                 |                      | 1743                    | 5                |  |
|   |  |                 |                      | DATE MAILED: 08/29/2002 |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | i An                              |   |  |  |  |  |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
|   | Applicati n N .                   | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Anti-us Common to  | 09/887,066                        | GILBERT ET AL.  |  |  |  |  |
| Offic Action Summary  | Examiner                          | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Samuel P Siefke                   | 1743  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication app<br>Period for Reply  | ears on the c ver sheet with the  | correspondence address                                    |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on  |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| •   | — ·<br>is action is non-final.    |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowa  |                                   | prosecution as to the merits is                           |  |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. <b>Disp sition of Claims</b>  |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.  |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.   |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.  |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.   |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o  | r election requirement.           |   |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers  |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.   |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep   |                                   | eved by the Examiner                                      |  |  |  |  |
| 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.   |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120   |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign   | n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1190 | (a)-(d) or (f).   |  |  |  |  |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  |                                   | •   |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority document  | s have been received.             | ·   |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage   |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.   |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.   |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Attachm nt(s)   |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)</li> </ol>  | 5) Notice of Informa              | ary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Il Patent Application (PTO-152) |  |  |  |  |
| J.S. Patent and Trademark Office  |                                   |   |  |  |  |  |

ShT1 :JinU hA

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

opvionaness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Hrdina (USPN 3,615,235) in view of Cheney et al. (USPN 5,566,720).

Hrdina teaches a flow through reactor, which forms a part of an analyzer that

comprises: a means for extracting in the gaseous form, means for transporting the

extracted gases, means inteded for analysis and measurement on theses extracted

dases.

Hrdina does not teach any information regarding the analyzer being used for

hydrocarbons and the specific material being incorporated in the transport tubing.

Cheney teaches an elongated fuel and vapor tube having multiple layers suitable

for conveying fluids containing hydrocarbons having a first layer disposed radially

innermost and having an inner surface capable of prolonged exposure to the hydrocarbon-confaining fluid that comprises of a fluoroplastic material being a terpolymeric material containing tetrafluoroethylene, vinylidine difluoride and hexafluoropropylene (abstract, col. 3, lines 37-40; col. 4, lines 18-33), the inner tube being externally protected by at least one other sheath (claim 1). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time to modify Hrdina to include the elongated fuel and vapor tube of Cheney because of the retention time of the hydrocarbons in the tubing during the transporting to the analyzer or the the hydrocarbons in the tubing during the use of hydrocarbons in the theins, the measurement means. Regarding the use of hydrocarbons in the the hrdina, the analyzer can be used with any gaseous mixture, including hydrocarbons for example and would still be able to analyze the gases, including hydrocarbons carried along by a drilling fluid after drilling in a reservoir rock.

0.5 mm and it is preferably below 0.2mm. Cheney teaches the inner tubing having a **total wall thickness** of between about 0.5 mm and 2 mm. At its smallest wall thickness 0.5 mm the wall comprises of three layers, an innermost, a secondary sub layer, and a second layer, a total of three layers (claim 14; col. 4, lines 34-46). Therefore at least one of the layers is below 0.2 mm.

Regarding claim 4, the thickness of the inner tube ranges between 0.1 mm and

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel P Siefke whose telephone number is 703-306-0093. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on 703-308-4037. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9311 for regular communications and 703-872-9310 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-

.1990

SAS

June 27, 2002

LYLE A. ALEXANDEP PRIMARY EXMINER